L111
.A3P18
v. 16

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 21 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Pamphlet No. 16. December, 1930.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
RAY LYMAN WILBUR, SECRETARY
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WILLIAM JOHN COOPER, COMMISSIONER
WASHINGTON, D. C.

U. S.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE HONOR SYSTEM AND ACADEMIC HONESTY IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

By C. O. MATHEWS,
Associate Professor of Education, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio

CONTENTS: Introduction—Section A.—Research studies and surveys showing the present status and special features of honor systems now in use; Section B—Research studies in academic honesty from the experimental side, the measurement of cheating, deceit, etc.; Section C—Descriptive and discussional material of a general nature; Section D—Descriptive and discussional material relating to specific institutions.

INTRODUCTION

During the past few years in the institution in which the author teaches, there have been spirited discussions both among students and faculty members as to the efficacy of the local honor system. These discussions stimulated him to investigate the experiences reported by other institutions and the bearings of recent research upon the problem of student honor. Through this casual reading a number of relevant studies or discussions were discovered and abstracts made.

During the year 1929–30, a faculty committee was appointed to make an intensive study of local conditions with a view to making recommendations concerning the future status of the system. It seemed wise, before coming to the point of making recommendations, to become thoroughly acquainted with the published literature on

the subject. As chairman of the committee, the writer undertook the compilation of an extensive annotated bibliography, since an earlier search made it evident that no adequate one existed. This resulted in 94 references which were included as Part V of this committee's report.

Requests for the bibliography from several interested institutions and groups have made it evident that it should be as complete as possible and should be published. Opportunities to use the library facilities of Ohio State University, University of North Carolina, and Columbia University during the summer of 1930 made it possible to add a number of references not previously available. Although an attempt has been made to compile an exhaustive bibliography up to September, 1930, it is probable that some significant references have been overlooked.

The bibliography is limited to articles and books on the honor system or any phase of honesty in school work. Although the honor system in a few institutions has been expanded to include other types of moral conduct, general discussions or studies on these phases of conduct or on character training have not been included except where specific mention has been made of the honor system. Other good bibliographies exist on those subjects. Neither have references on student government been included unless they contained information relative to academic honesty or the honor system. No references have been cited to local handbooks setting forth rules and regulations of specific universities regarding honor and academic honesty.

The references have been grouped under four captions for the convenience of users of the bibliography. Those in Sections A and B are types of research studies. Those in Section A are questionnaires and interview studies which report the prevalence of the honor system, and some of its special features in different institutions. Section B includes research studies into the psychology and ethics of the subject, such as attempts to test and measure cheating, to analyze academic honesty, to determine the meaning and prevalence of deceit and its relationships with other factors, such as character, religion, etc. Sections C and D include only discussional and descriptive types of articles, those of the former section being rather general and those of the latter relating to specific institutions.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to President Edmund D. Soper, of Ohio Wesleyan University, for the privilege of revising, expanding and publishing this section of the official report of the faculty committee; to the members of that committee, Professors W. R. Diem, Harry F. Lewis, Gertrude Manchester, and Chester Murray for their criticisms and suggestions, and to Selma M. Mathews for criticisms and proof-reading.

The author is under obligation to Dr. William John Cooper, United State Commissioner of Education, for publishing the bibliography as a document of his office and for the services rendered by him and his library staff in getting it ready for publication.

SECTION A. STUDIES SHOWING PRESENT STATUS AND VARIOUS FEATURES OF HONOR SYSTEMS

Baldwin, Bird T. Honor as a college asset. Education, 52: 471–77, December, 1916.

A brief summary of a survey of honor systems in colleges and universities. (See also reference no. 3, below)

——— The present status of the honor system. *In* Pennsylvania state educational association. Proceedings, 1913–1914. p. 213–14.

Presents in a condensed manner the chief data in the survey made by the author. (See also reference no. 3 below)

——— *and others.* The present status of the honor system in colleges and universities. Washington, Government printing office, 1915. 31 p. (U. S. Bureau of education. Bulletin, 1915, no. 8)

This report covers a rather extensive questionnaire survey of 425 American colleges and universities, 123 of which had some form of an honor system in all or some departments. Of these, 39.2 per cent are east of the Mississippi and south of the Mason and Dixon line, 5.6 per cent in New England, 29.6 per cent for men only, and 8 per cent for women only. The honor system is usually indicative of a highly developed form of student government. In all but 22 out of 116 colleges reporting on penalties the final decision is held by some faculty group. In 21 institutions instructors are absolutely excluded. Eleven pages contain excerpts from letters of respondents giving various points of view.

Bowden, A. O. *and* **Clarke, Ida Clyde.** The honour system. *In their* Tomorrow's Americans: a practical study in student self-government. New York, G. Putnam's sons, 1930. p. 138, 146–54.

Compilations of data collected from booklets and yearbooks of various student organizations in 1922–1923 show that 61 per cent had the honor system in examinations, 30 per cent did not have it, and 9 per cent did not state. No data are cited to show upon how many responses these figures are based nor how they were selected. The yearbooks of the College of William and Mary and of Washington and Lee University are quoted to show the nature of these two honor systems.

Edwards, R. H.; Artman, J. M. *and* **Fisher, Galen M.** Honor systems. *In their* Undergraduate, a study of morale in 23 American colleges and universities. Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, Doran and company, Inc., 1928. p. 227–38.

An investigation made by the Institute of social and religious research upon the suggestion of the Association of American colleges. The investigation covered many aspects of college life, of which the honor system was one. The conclusions are based upon the facts gathered by special visitors to each campus, in interviews with those students and faculty members who were most likely to be well informed regarding the local situation.

Of the 23 schools, 18 had some type of honor system and 5 had none. The authors recognize their inability to point out demonstratable conclusions with finality, but try to appraise these honor systems in the light of their findings and their knowledge as university officials and their general philosophy of education. They point out that most honor systems are deficient in that they place emphasis upon penalizing offenders instead of upon guidance and counsel, and that they demand a conflict of loyalties when students are expected to report on each other. They conclude that, in their opinion, dependence upon the spirit of honor throughout the student body is as effective as an organized honor system.

Jackson, James T. The honor system. Howard college, Birmingham, Alabama, 1928. 64 p. (Howard college bulletin, vol. 86, no. 4. October, 1928.)

A senior thesis in sociology at Howard college. The facts were collected by questionnaire, personal correspondence, and from source references in educational literature. It is organized in 10 chapters and discusses the origin, spread, and present status of the honor system. A bibliography on honor systems and student government is included.

——— Honor system. *In* National student federation of the United States of America. Yearbook, 1928–29. New York, N. Y., Publications committee, 1929. p. 19, 23–25.

Plans for aid to students interested in honor systems are given. The extent of honor systems in America, their distribution, size of schools and educational values are discussed.

Keppel, Frederick P. [Student honor.] *In his* The undergraduate and his college. Boston, Houghton Mifflin company, 1917. p. 114–116, 152–153.

Some student points-of-view in regard to honor are suggested. A survey of honor systems in 280 colleges, made by Mr. Lester of the Hill school, is referred to briefly. Thirty per cent of these colleges have honor systems. Of these 60 per cent are for men. Two-fifths of the foregoing colleges are located in the South. About one-third of the institutions having the honor system require a definite promise from students to report dishonesty. There is no evidence to show how the colleges studied were selected nor how representative they were other than that they, alone of the 350 written to, responded.

Lyman, R. L. The problem of student honor in colleges and universities. School review, 35: 253–71, April, 1927.

This report of an investigation of the agencies dealing with honesty in 50 universities was made by the University honor commission of the University of Chicago. The prevalence of dishonesty, the agencies of control, characteristics of honor systems, extent of honor systems in American colleges, arguments for and against such systems, practices in giving examinations conducive to honesty, penalties for cheating, and means of promoting sentiment for honesty are the chief topics treated.

Moore, Mary T. The honor system, its extent and application. Bulletin of the American association of collegiate registrars, new series, 1: 157–72, July, 1925.

This study embraces 80 out of 140 institutions to which the questionnaire was sent. Twenty-four of these were Eastern and Southern schools and 56 were Middle Western or Western. Of the 48 having the honor system all but 10 were in the East and South. Reports from the various schools are discussed.

Sheehy, Maurice S. Honor systems in Catholic colleges. *In his* Problems of student guidance. Philadelphia, The Dolphin press, 1929. p. 213–216.

Of 30 Catholic colleges of the National Catholic education association cooperating in a study of student welfare and guidance, only one had the honor system in practice and this one doubted its feasibility. In another college where it was not in practice its practicability was granted and in a third it was thought suitable for upper classes. It was definitely classed as undesirable by 21 of the 30 institutions. The author's criticism of the system is that it treats the symptoms of dishonesty instead of its fundamental causes.

United States. Bureau of education. Library division. List of references on student self-government and the honor system. Washington, Government printing office, 1925. 6 p. 8°. (Library leaflet no. 31, March, 1925.)

A list dealing with the system as used in both high schools and colleges.

SECTION B. RESEARCH STUDIES IN ACADEMIC HONESTY

Atkins, Blanche E. A study of honesty in tests with teachers college students. Master's thesis. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., 1927. 126 p. ms.

The study was to discover the amount of dishonesty manifested in the self correction of tests and the effect of education in honesty on college students. Dishonesty was

discovered in the teachers, but not more than in other students. An increase of 5.7 per cent in the measure of honesty was found to be due to 30 minutes of instruction in honesty.

Bathurst, J. E. *and others.* Written tests of honesty (integrity). Public personnel studies, 7: 98–106, 1929.

Comparisons are made between the proportion of applicants for positions, police women, high-school pupils, and boys in a correctional school who cheated for personal advantage. The amount of cheating is found to increase as the incentive for cheating increased. School children cheated more than adults and dull individuals cheated more than those of higher intelligence.

Bird, Charles. A method for removing the temptation to cheat in objective examinations. University of Minnesota faculty bulletin, 3: 1–4, 1928.

The method described consists of comparing the number of identical errors made by students suspected of cheating with the number expected by chance.

———. An improved method of detecting cheating in objective examinations. Journal of educational research, 19: 341–348, May, 1929.

Describes three methods utilized to detect cheating in university classes. In testing 945 students in psychology, suspects were reported by proctors. Through a comparison of identical errors and other methods, 29 cases of cheating were detected and sent to the discipline committee.

———. Detection of cheating in objective examinations. School and society, 25: 261–262, February 26, 1927.

The comparison of identical errors made by adjacent pupils with the average of those made by nonadjacent pupils is proposed as a means of detecting cheating. The method is illustrated.

Blomfield, Frances M. Church schools tested. Religious education, 22: 471–476, May, 1927.

Multiple choice tests of Biblical and moral knowledge were given to 187 Sunday school children. Certain items in the test relate to honesty in school work and with property. The exact number of responses to each alternative for each item is given in the report. No data concerning the reliability and validity of the test are given.

Brownell, H. C. Mental-test traits of college cribbers. School and society, 27: 764, June 23, 1928.

In intelligence 58 per cent of the cheaters were below the campus average; 71 per cent were more extrovert than the average; and 80 per cent were more psycho-neurotic than the average. The author concludes that "low intelligence demands cheating, extroversion promotes it, and psychoneuroticism breaks down the morale."

Cady, V. M. The estimation of juvenile incorrigibility. Journal of delinquency monograph, no. 2, 1923. 140. p.

Cady instructed a battery of group tests for the measurement of incorrigibility. Several of these tests deal particularly with trustworthiness. They were administered to a large number of public-school boys 13 and 14 years of age, from which 121 corrigibles and 29 incorrigibles were selected for the final study. These were compared with 70 boys from the Whittier state school for boys. Detailed data show the reliability and validity of the tests and the relative honesty of the various groups of boys.

Campbell, W. G. *and* Koch, H. L. Student honesty in a university with an honor system. School and society, 31: 232–40, February 15, 1930.

This is a carefully controlled study of dishonesty in a large State university in which an honor system had prevailed for many years. Evidence is submitted to show the relation of dishonesty to age, intelligence, scholastic attainment, type of test instruction concerning dishonesty, and method of supervising examinations. Lectures of an inspirational and informational type did not decrease dishonesty. Those who cheated were not materially different from noncheaters as to average age, mental test score, educational age or general university grade. Students generally wanted the honor system retained although about a third of them admitted that they had cheated under it, and over 95 per cent said they would not report observed dishonesty to school authorities. There was relatively more cheating among students trained under high-school honor systems.

Carter, Thomas M. Cheating as seen by college students. International journal of ethics, 39: 341–55, April, 1929.

Five questions relating to the detection, handling, evaluation and causation of cheating were answered by 443 students in Albion college. Findings: Students vary widely in their attitudes toward cheaters and in their evaluations of situations. The two chief causes of cheating are thought to be fear of being dropped from college, and the desire for high grades for admission to fraternities and sororities. Only 18 per cent attributed their college cheating to habits acquired in high school.

———. What college students think with respect to cheating in examination. Phi delta kappan, 9: 3–10, June, 1928.

Data were derived from replies to questions relating to a verbal problem of honesty submitted to 443 students in Albion college. They throw light on students' opinions of the evidence necessary for suspecting cheating, the duty of the professor in such a case, the action to be taken with the parties involved, the relative seriousness of cheating, and the motives leading students to cheat.

Chambers, E. V. Study of dishonesty among the students of a parochial secondary school. Pedagogical seminary, 33: 717–28, December, 1926.

The prevalence of cheating and student attitudes toward it are studied by the use of three techniques. A series of 20 specific verbal problems involving honesty, a questionnaire of 20 items, and a study of mid-term tests are used. There seems to be an increase in the prevalence of dishonesty with advancement in high school. It decreases under strict supervision. Although no data are given to show the effect of religious training on dishonesty, it is evident that training does not eliminate it.

Charters, W. W. Ideals, situations and trait actions. Elementary school journal, 25: 424–36, February, 1925.

Beginning with the postulate that "ideals affect conduct only in connection with specific acts" the author presents an analysis of the situations in which the ideal of honesty may be applied. There are 10 general groups of these situations each with more specific situations and concrete examples. The subject is similiarly treated in the volume listed below.

———. The teaching of ideals. New York, The Macmillan company, 1927. xiii, 372 p. 12°.

Analyses of honesty situations in public schools and in a women's dormitory school are given. Other sections in the book relate to problems of teaching honesty.

Chassell, C. F. *and others.* A test of ability to weigh foreseen consequences. Teachers college record, 25: 39–50, January, 1924.

A description of an objective test organized around seven original stories, each suggesting important problems of conduct. One of the stories, "On their Honor," with its accompanying test items, is specifically on copying and reporting dishonesty in examinations. Several other subtests relate to problems of honesty and truthfulness.

Clark, F. A. Some character tests. American educational digest, 46: 225–26, January, 1927.

Variations of Voekler and Cady's "peeping" tests were taken by a large number of vacation Bible school students. From 25 to 30 per cent of the children cheated. The age differences are slightly in favor of the younger children, though this, perhaps, is not significant. Length of Sunday-school attendance seems not to be related to honesty.

Cowen, P. A. Professional spirit? School and society, 26: 108–9, July 23, 1927.

Having given an examination in statistics under such a short time limit that it was impossible for any student to finish, the author collected the papers, and, previous to the next class hour, scored them, making no marks on the papers. At the beginning of the next class period students were asked to score their own papers from solutions the instructor placed on the blackboard. Nine out of 31 students changed their answers in such a way as to receive a higher score.

Dearborn, F. R. What does honesty mean to third and fourth grade children? Journal of educational method, 6: 205–12, January, 1927.

Results of 259 children's responses to questions concerning honesty show a wide variety of meanings and interpretations. There are wide differences between childrens' and adults' concepts. The temptation to copy and cheat is frequently mentioned. The use of literature in teaching honesty is discussed.

Dishonesty in classroom work. Religious education, 21: 358–360, August, 1926.

The results of interviews of members of a faculty committee with 300 students at the University of Wisconsin are summarized. The extent of dishonesty, its causes and recommended remedies are included.

Doyle, Lillian *and* **Foote, Marie.** The pledge as an instrument to secure honesty in examinations. Peabody journal of education, 3: 79–84, September, 1925.

In a high school of 750 students and 24 teachers all students were asked without previous warning at the close of a certain test period to sign a pledge that they had neither given nor received help. Questionnaires later submitted without warning both to teachers and to pupils showed that 75 students acknowledged cheating although only 25 refused to sign the pledge. Teachers saw or suspected about 22 per cent of the cheating acknowledged. Although 55 per cent of the students favored the use of the pledge only 22 per cent of the teachers favored it.

Dudycha, George J. The moral and popular beliefs of college freshmen. School and society, 32: 69–72, July 12, 1930.

Ninety-seven freshmen at Ripon college indicated the firmness of their beliefs in various moral propositions. Several of these propositions relate to academic honesty. Ninety-five per cent believe implicitly that "honesty is the best policy," but there is wide variation of opinions as to the wrongness of bluffing and the obligation to report cases of cribbing.

English, H. B. Bluffing in examination. American journal of psychology, 40: 350, April, 1928.

Two groups of college students were asked to indicate their knowledge of the meanings of certain terms in psychology by correctly answering a series of multiple choice questions. They were instructed not to guess. Three fictitious terms inserted with legitimate terms elicited responses of varying lengths from 41.3 per cent of one group, and 27.6 per cent of the other.

Fenton, Norman. Objective study of student honesty during examinations. School and society, 26: 341–44, September 10, 1927.

The study is based on the conduct of 31 sophomore and junior women in a college not having an honor system. The techniques used included casual observations by the instructor, observation by student spies, and replies to a question blank. Honesty is found to correlate positively with achievement and intelligence. Those who have attended elementary and high schools employing some form of honor system, cheated less than the others, on the average.

Fernberger, S. W. On bluffing in examinations. American journal of psychology, 38: 155–56, January, 1927.

An experiment was made in which the false term "psychoterminality" was given among nine other terms to psychology students to explain. Two students admitted that they did not know the term, six omitted the question, and 21 others wrote from one-half to three pages each.

Good, Carter V. [The problems of student attitude, cheating, and honor in examinations.] *In his* Teaching in college and university, Baltimore, Warwick and York, Inc., 1929. p. 286–87.

Reference is made here to several of the surveys and studies on "student attitude, cheating and honor in examinations."

Gundlach, Ralph. A method for the detection of cheating in college examinations. School and society, 22: 215–16, August 15, 1925.

Describes a method of measuring the amount of cheating in groups by comparing the identical errors of neighbors and nonneighbors. Results from the use of this technique with 350 college students show that the average number of errors is about 10 per cent less when partners profit from each other, but that their identical errors increase about 18 or 20 per cent.

Hartshorne, Hugh *and* May, Mark A. Testing the knowledge of right and wrong: Group standards and group conduct. Religious education, 22: 523–32, May, 1927.

The authors show that although the agreement between knowledge of ideal conduct and actual conduct for individuals is low, it is high when fairly homogeneous groups are compared with each other. This suggests the importance of common influences such as may come from the group, the teacher, the school, tradition, etc.

———————. Studies in deceit. New York, The Macmillan company, 1928. Book I, 414 p. Book II, 306 p. 12°.

This publication sets forth the most extensive scientific studies of deceit that have appeared. After test situations which would measure deception had been selected or devised, children were placed in these situations and records made of their conduct. The studies cover school children's cheating conduct in 22 classroom situations, 4 athletic contests, 2 party games, and 1 situation involving deception in assigned home work. Their lying conduct is studied in 46 situations and stealing conduct in 3 situations. The chief results of these elaborate studies are set forth briefly on pages 402–414 of Book I.

Classroom associations, general personal handicaps, cultural and social limitations and other miscellaneous factors closely accompany deception of school children.

A bibliography of 48 references on methods of detecting and measuring deceit is listed in appendix A of Book II.

——————— *and* Shuttleworht, Frank K. Studies in the organization of character. New York, The Macmillan company, 1930. 503 p. 12°.

This volume, No. III, of the Character education inquiry summarizes studies of the relation and consistency of various behavior tendencies. The studies set forth among other things the relationships between honesty and about twenty-five other factors. One of the most significant findings is the relatively high relationship (r=.776) between honesty and the integration of honesty. This means that children who measured high in honesty tended to be quite consistently honest and those who were dishonest were not consistently so. References to these facts are found on pages 139–44, 154–68, 229–30, 248–49, 294–347, 351.

Hillbrand, E. K. Cheating in college. School and society, 26: 748–50, December 10, 1927.

The author summarizes replies from 25 deans of colleges in the North central association in regard to problems connected with cheating in colleges. Suggested courses, means of lessening cheating, penalties, and honor systems are discussed. The deans appear to believe that there had been a gradual decline in cheating during the 4 or 5 years previous to the report.

Honesty in college examinations under the honor system. School and society, 31: 577–80, April 26, 1930.

A test consisting of 30 objective questions was given to 72 freshmen and 57 juniors just prior to the reporting of term grades. These tests were removed from the room, duplicated, and returned for scoring before the end of the hour. Each student scored his own test. Forty-six per cent of the freshmen and 25 per cent of juniors changed their papers in order to raise their grades. Those with scholarship and intelligence scores in the lowest quartile cheated more frequently than those in the highest quartile. The same experiment repeated shortly after term grades had been reported showed a smaller percentage of cheating.

Jones, Vernon. Ideas of right and wrong among teachers and children. Teacher college records, 30: 529–41, March, 1929.

After constructing a "Test of ethical choices" around 16 concrete ethical situations, Jones submitted it to 177 seventh and eighth grade children and to 159 teachers. Sev-

eral of the items relate to honesty of behavior and of report. The chief finding was that very wide variations of ethical judgment existed both among teachers and children and between the two groups.

Katz, D. The Syracuse reaction study: its development and resulting measurements of attitudes on cribbing and grading. Master's thesis. Syracuse university, Syracuse, N. Y., 1926.

This study is cited and abstracted in part by May, Hartshorne, and Welty in the Psychological bulletin, 24: 423, July, 1927. The attitudes of 1,500 college students toward cribbing is reported. About 50 per cent of those answering the questionnaire admitted that they had cribbed, and about 39 per cent assigned unfair grading as the chief cause of cheating.

Laird, D. A. A report on students' attitudes toward laboratory courses. School and society, 19: 589–92, May 17, 1924.

Seventeen members of a former class of 38 who had completed a laboratory course in educational psychology were interviewed by a person other than the teacher to determine the amount of dishonesty practiced by faking experiments. Three students faked none, six many, and eight most of the experiments according to their own testimony. Numerous rationalizations were advanced by students wholly or partially to justify them in such dishonesty.

Marvin, A. D. Dishonesty in the American school and its cause. Education, 44: 290–98, January, 1924.

A questionnaire of 21 items on students' attitudes toward cheating and dishonesty was given to 110 summer school students. Nineteen per cent of this class were estimated to be dishonest by fellow students, 74 per cent admitted that they had been dishonest at one time or another. Eighty per cent believed cheating was wrong, yet 55 per cent were able to justify it. Ninety-nine per cent said they would not take advantage of the absence of the teacher, yet 63 per cent believed that others would be dishonest under the honor system.

May, M. A. *and* **Hartshorne, Hugh.** First steps toward a scale for measuring attitudes. Journal of educational psychology, 17: 145–62, March, 1926.

The authors describe a technique for scaling attitudes towards situations involving cheating. The scale consists of seven steps ranging from situations in which cheating is very easy to those in which it is very difficult. In testing 32 children in a bright 5A group and 263 children in an institution for dependents with an average I. Q. of 97, it was found that 84 per cent of the children cheated in varying degrees. A correlation of —.40 is reported between intelligence and cheating.

——————— Experimental studies in moral education. Religious education, 22: 712–15, September, 1927.

Three studies are reported showing the influence of various factors on the tendency to deceive. Dishonesty is shown to increase with length of membership in an organization which rewarded dishonest reports. Verbal pledges to be honest in another organization did not produce honest habits. Pupils of a school using more progressive, freer methods were shown to have engaged in less deception than those in a school using traditional methods.

Miller, G. F. An experimental test of intellectual honesty. School and society, 26: 852–54, December 31, 1927.

The instructor handed back examination papers incorrectly graded under controlled conditions to find the extent to which two groups of university students would honestly report errors when asked to look over and check their papers. In a group of 48 undergraduates, 7.7 per cent of those who were probably aware of errors reported them. In a group of 25 slightly more advanced students, this percentage was 58.3. The errors were more often reported when they were not in favor of the student.

Murdock, Katharine. A study of differences found between races in intellect and morality. School and society, 22: 628–32, 659–64, November 14, 21, 1925.

The author gave an adaptation of Voelker's peeping test to 12-year old children of several racial groups. The racial differences in scores are pointed out.

Persing, K. M. Morals and chemistry. Educational review, 72: 164–68, October, 1926.

The amount of dishonesty in certain classroom work was studied and the relationship between dishonesty and students' statements in regard to what they would do in such situations. The author systematically graded numerous papers too high and too low. In a high-school group, 97 per cent of the pupils reported grades which were too low, while 97 per cent said they would so report. Although 80.5 per cent said they would report an overgrading, in reality only 9.5 per cent so reported. In an elementary-school group 85.4 per cent reported erroneously low grades, 82.3 per cent stating that they would do so, and only 21.5 per cent reported grades erroneously too high, although 82.3 per cent stated that they would do so.

Raubenheimer, A. S. An experimental study of some behavior traits of the potentially delinquent boy. Psychological monographs, 34: no. 6, May, 1923. 107 p.

Two of the seven tests and blanks used by the author to detect delinquent tendencies in boys concern honesty of report. On these two tests (fictitious book titles and overstatement) boys from privileged communities appear to be more honest than those from less privileged communities. They are considerably more honest than a group of delinquent boys in a parental school.

Sheehy, Maurice S. Some aspects of collegiate honesty. Ecclesiastical review, 79: 123–32, August, 1928.

In a study of classroom dishonesty among 300 college students, 65 per cent admitted that they had cheated at some time during their college careers. One hundred and sixty had begun their dishonest practices in high school, while 57 had not cheated in high school, but had in college. Students believed that moral and religious instruction was the most impelling force toward honest conduct.

Slaght, W. E. Untruthfulness in children: its conditioning factors and its setting in child nature. Studies in character, vol. 1, no. 4. University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa., State university, February 15, 1928. 79 p.

By the use of 3 objective tests, 70 pupils who were consistently untruthful and 70 who were consistently truthful were selected from a group of 356 pupils for intensive study. In regard to the relationship of certain factors to truthfulness, the author shows that intelligence is relatively negligible, and that the truthful pupils are less suggestible, more stable, less inclined to overstatement, have a wider range of information and, in general, come from more favorable home surroundings. Several new test forms and a bibliography are included.

Smith, H. O. A study of deceit in high-school students. Master's thesis. Emory university, Atlanta, Georgia, 1928.

Tests were applied to pupils in each year of high school, and an analysis made to determine the relation of deceitful behavior to intelligence, to year in school, to social status, etc.

Tatum, W. S. Comparison of the direct and indirect methods of teaching honesty. Master's thesis, 1928. University of Colorado, Boulder. 83 p. ms.

A study of 84 members of a tenth grade in a mid-western six-year-high school. The direct method was found to be more satisfactory in teaching honesty than the indirect method. The great number of variable factors that enter into character testing made it impossible, with present methods of control, to determine behavior. Cheating, generally speaking, was found to be more prevalent with the lower I. Q. people, because of greater pressure put upon them.

Terman, L. M. *and others.* Tests of character and personality traits. *In their* Genetic studies of genius. Vol. I. Stanford university, Calif., Stanford university press, 1925. p. 485–517.

A detailed description is given of a battery of seven character tests. Three of these measure trustworthiness and honesty of report. Directions for administering and scoring them are given. Results from testing 532 gifted and 533 unselected school children show that in honesty of report and trustworthiness from 57 to 73 per cent of the gifted children surpass the mean of the unselected children. Girls surpass boys in honesty of report but boys surpass girls slightly on the tests of trustworthiness.

Thelin, E. *and* **Scott, P. C.** An investigation of bluffing. American journal of psychology, 40: 613–19, October, 1928.

Numerous fictitious items were inserted along with authentic ones in an objective test of English usage and literature. The extent to which bluffing took place is indicated by the number of responses to fictitious items. Bluffing scores range from 5 to 81 per cent with a mean of 44.6 per cent for a university group, and one of 25.7 per cent for a nonuniversity group made up of bookkeepers, pressmen, salesmen, etc. The average for men is 45.8 per cent and for women 43.4 per cent. Students ranking lowest in quality of academic work bluffed most. A zero correlation between intelligence and bluffing is reported.

Tudor-Hart, B. E. Are there cases in which lies are necessary? Pedagogical seminary, 33: 586–641, December, 1926.

The question "Are there cases in which lies are necessary?" was presented to second, third, and fourth year pupils in an elementary school in Vienna and to children in one elementary and one high school in two middle west cities of the United States. The American children were also asked to solve a verbal moral problem in which a young man had cheated on an examination to obtain a position. The replies are classified in various ways showing age, sex and motive differences.

Tuttle, H. S. Testing the curriculum in its natural setting. Religious education, 24: 173–75, February, 1929.

Among other things, this study furnishes data to show the effects of worship, moral instruction, projects in cooperative altruism, and Bible study upon cheating. It was found that the groups given direct moral instruction gained more in honesty than groups in which this factor was omitted.

Voelker, Paul Frederick. The functions of ideals and attitudes in social education. New York, Teachers College, Columbia university, 1921. 126 p. 8°. (Contribution to education, No. 112.)

This is a pioneer study in attempting to measure honesty of conduct. It is suggestive both for the tests utilized and for the findings, showing that ideals and training proved to be effective in raising the level of behavior among boy scouts of the experimental group.

Woodrow, H. H. *and* **Bemmels, Violet.** Overstatement as a test of general character in pre-school children. Journal of educational psychology, 18: 239–46, April, 1927.

A modification of Voelker's overstatement-test was given to 17 five-year-olds in a kindergarten of a public school and to 14 four-year-olds in the Minnesota institute for child welfare. Only one child understated his abilities. The five-year-olds, on the average, said they could perform 75 per cent of the tasks but actually succeeded with only 50 per cent. The corresponding percentages for the four-year-olds were 51 and 30.

Yepsen, L. N. The reliability of self-scored measures. School and society, 26: 657–60, November 19, 1927.

The Ohio literacy test was given to two groups and, unknown to the groups. Experienced clerks scored and returned the tests during the class hour. Students were then permitted to score their own papers, handing them in at the end of the class period. In the first group of 27 students 29.5 per cent changed their scores. In a larger group of 51 women and 2 men, of which the former 27 were members, 24.5 per cent changed or added to their answers so as to raise their scores.

——— ——— School and society, 29: 681–82, May 25, 1929.

Having given a short test to 56 women and 3 men, the papers were removed from the room without their knowledge and all responses copied by trained workers while the class took a longer and different test. Before the end of the period, the papers having been returned, each pupil scored his own test from a key slowly read by the examiner. Thirty-four per cent of the total group made changes in their responses. Twelve per cent of these were below the median of the group in intelligence and 22 per cent were above the median.

SECTION C. GENERAL DISCUSSIONS OF ACADEMIC HONESTY AND THE HONOR SYSTEM

Allinson, F. G. The honor system in college and out. Nation, 83: 458–59, November 29, 1906.

Attention is called to the fallacy "that students may be expected to cheat if watched." Instructors do not lose all responsibility for honest conduct of students by turning certain rights over to others. Students' claims for privileges should carry with them responsibilities.

Ambercombie, D. W. Honesty in school work. Education, 33: 289–99, January, 1913.

Schools should be agencies for training in proper conduct. Students often believe that cheating is not dishonorable if they can "get by." Supervision lessens temptations to do wrong.

Briggs, L. B. R. College honor. Atlantic monthly, 88: 483–89, October, 1901.

This article on honor in college life states that the honor system represents an attempt on the part of the students themselves to raise their code of ethics in regard to the work it covers.

Butterfield, E. W. Who is dishonest? Discussion of honesty tests. School and society, 29: 360–62, March 16, 1929,

The author criticizes those methods of testing honesty which involve deliberately placing before the children temptations to cheat.

Chamberlin, J. H. The honor system. *In* National student federation of the United States of America. Yearbook, 1928. Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Vassar college, 1928. p. 17.

The principal recommendation of a group of delegates which involved encouraging the establishment of honor systems not after any one pattern but in accordance with the traditions of the institutions. Adequate publicity and enforcement provisions are cited as essential.

Cheating at college. Literary digest, 106: 20, July 26, 1930.

Various expressions of public opinion are shown in regard to an editorial in the Yale *News* stating that at least half of the undergraduates in this institution cheat in examinations.

Clippinger, Walter G. [The honor system.] *In his* Student relationships. New York, Thomas Nelson and sons, 1926. p. 108.

President Clippinger argues against the honor system, holding that "the common code of absolute honesty in class work, in social relations, and in business [is] sufficient for intelligent young people."

Colwell, W. A. Honor system. Nation, 98: 663–64, June, 1914.

The point of view taken is that the honor system may not work efficiently in a large institution, but if it fails in a small college, something is wrong with the sense of honesty and responsibility among the students.

Ferguson, Rex. Atlantic monthly, 134: 355–60, September, 1924.

A picture of the present-day college generation as seen by middle age. The point of view is shown in the quotation, "What has the code done for Ferguson?" (one of the students) It has made the Honor system a reality."

Firkins, O. W. Honor system. Nation, 98: 538–40, May 7, 1914.

This is a criticism of certain principles which seemed to be assumed in some honor systems. For example, that students have a "prerogative" of cheating which they willingly abandon if the instructor will leave the room; and secondly, that equal trust should be placed upon all students, those who do not warrant it as well as those who do.

Frasier, T. W. *and* Wrinkle, W. L. Experiments in teacher's college administration. Educational administration and supervision, 14: 499–505, October, 1928.

Several phases of student government are discussed. The honor system was abandoned because students did not want to report each other. They preferred to deal with the administration and requested abolition of the system.

Gavit, John P. [The honor system.] *In his* College. New York, Harcourt, Brace and company, 1925. p. 80–84.

The "spirit" of the honor system is discussed. The author is favorable to the principles underlying an honor system opposed to encouraging "tattling" by statute.

——— The honor system. School and society, 25: 289–92, March 5, 1927.

A severe criticism is leveled at the use of a pledge in an honor system. More comprehensive and better prepared examinations are suggested as a remedy for much cheating.

Geiger, J. R. Some misconceptions of the honor system. Virginia teacher, 8: 307–13, December, 1927.

To educate rather than to regulate is the chief function of an honor system. Another misconception is the student's responsibility in reporting cases. The student *is* the policeman and must assume this responsibility if the system is effective.

———. The educational value of the honor system. School and society, 21: 516–22, May 2, 1925.

There are not only honest and dishonest students but also those who are in a transition from one point of view to a higher one about such matters. For them the honor system is a valuable device. Means for making a system effective are enumerated.

———. The honor system in colleges. International journal of ethics, 32: 398–409, July, 1922.

Requirements for an effective honor system are discussed. The author favors the system as a means of creating and maintaining conditions which stimulate moral behavior and its development.

Gleaves, C. L. Report on the honor system. National student federation of the United States of America. Yearbook, 1926. Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Vassar college, 1927. p. 13–14.

A report of a committee of the N. S. F. A. favoring the honor system, believing that its good features outweigh its bad ones.

Griffin, H. D. Safeguarding the final examination. School and society, 23: 342–44, March 13, 1926.

In arranging objective examinations it is recommended that the sheets be assembled in as many different orders as there are sheets and that the resulting forms be passed out in such a way that neighbors will not have identical forms. Each student is to begin with his first sheet, working under a liberal time limit and to turn to the second one only when time to do so has been announced by the instructor.

Hawes, J. A. Self-government and the honor system. *In his* Twenty years among the twenty-year-olds. New York, E. P. Dutton and company, Inc., 1929. p. 124–32.

A discussional treatment of the principles underlying the establishment of honor and an honor system among college students. The author would distinguish clearly between an honor system and student government. The system at the University of Virginia is described in some detail as an example of a successful system.

Hines, H. C. The honor system and the normal curve. School and society, 26: 481–85, October 15, 1927.

Students' reasons for desiring an honor system are cited and criticized. The author believes that the transfer values of honesty in examinations to other life activities have been over-stated.

The honor business. Bulletin of the Association of university professors, 14: 216–17, March, 1928.

This is an excerpt from an article in *"The new student."* The point of view is "That college students do cheat in examinations and that they feel no loss of dignity in so doing."

Hyde, W. D. Honor system in examinations. Nation, 83: 412–13, November 15, 1906.

The chief objection to the honor system is that it is "ethically extravagant." Although students at Bowdoin college were on their honor to report, almost all cases for consideration came from the internal evidence on examinations.

Joynes, E. S. The honor system again. Nation, 99: 15, July 2, 1914.

Argumentative article favoring the honor system. The author favors abolishing the pledge and making the honor system applicable to all conduct.

Joynes, N. E. Honor system in college. Nation, 83: 259, September 26, 1906.

The author holds that the honor system lessens rowdyism in a classroom and establishes relations between students and faculty on a basis of faith in each other.

Lefevre, Arthur. The honor system. *In his* The organization and administration of a state's institutions of higher education. Austin, Texas, Von Boeckmann-Jones company, 1914. p. 477–96

A few of the principles of honor systems are discussed, followed by lengthy testimonials which illustrate its effectiveness in certain schools.

Lester, J. A. Honor system. Nation, 94: 435–36, May 2, 1912.

Honesty "does not depend on any honor system" and the problem of honor and honesty is confused by making the breach of a pledge the chief issue in maintaining honesty.

Lewis, William Draper. The honor system of conducting examinations in law schools. *In* American bar association. Report, 1910. p. 1003–1006.

The author sets forth what he considers three fundamental principles which a faculty should recognize in discussing the adoption of a system and indicates what he believes makes for good and poor results in the system.

Lorenzen, E. G. *and others.* Discussion of the honor system. *In* American bar association. Report, 1910. p. 927–53. (Also in Report of Association of American law schools. Proceedings, 1910, p. 15–40.)

This is a formal discussion by Dean Lorenzen, of George Washington university, of two papers on the honor system in law schools read by Dean Lewis, of Pennsylvania, and Dean Lile, of Virginia, before the annual meeting of the Association of American law schools. Following this, open discussion from the floor brought out many arguments for and against honor systems. The practical working of systems in numerous universities were cited as evidence both by those favoring and those opposing such systems.

McConn, Max. Who ought to rule the college? *In his* College or kindergarten? New York, New republic, inc., 1928. p. 256–66.

Criticises the honor system, pointing out what seem to be three basic faults, namely, that it produces an artificial distinction between common honesty and honor in academic work; that one's consent to any regulation is necessary before he is bound to obey it; and, that honesty among a circumscribed group is sufficient.

McGregor, A. L. A concrete problem in school morals. Education, 43: 310–15, January, 1923.

The question of cheating in the elementary and high school is discussed. The growth of this tendency is traced and various causes and remedies suggested. No organized honor system is suggested, but, rather, the importance of developing habits of right conduct based on an inner control.

MacLean, Grace E. Question of honor. Educational review, 48: 91–94, June, 1914.

Statement favoring the honor system based on the experience of the author as a member of the faculty in Oxford college for women, Oxford, Ohio.

Mattfield, H. W. Some practical aspects of the honor system. School review, 32: 688–93, November, 1924.

The principles of the honor system are discussed from the viewpoint of the secondary school.

National honesty bureau. The honesty book. Preliminary edition. New York, National honesty bureau, 1923. 56 p.

Talks on various phases of honesty which have been given by William B. Forbush to children in the schools. They are in a form suitable to be used by others in teaching honesty. One section contains talks especially adaptable to problems of honesty in school situations. It is intended that these should stimulate a spirit of honesty as well as give the details for the building up of a code and a system for honor.

O'Shaughnessy, B. Honor system in American universities. Harper's weekly, 56: 25, November 30, 1912.

The moral effects of habitual cheating are pointed out and the honor system described as a means of handling the problem.

Phelps, W. L. Student honesty in college. Education, 33: 300–2, January, 1913.

Honor systems cannot be effective unless student sentiment is overwhelmingly in favor of them. "Unless an honor system is very much more effective than faculty supervision it would be much better for all concerned to have faculty supervision."

Selvidge, R. W. New trait test. School and society, 27: 108–9, January 28, 1928.

A criticism of L. N. Yepsen's technique described in his article, "The reliability of self-scored measures." The author is opposed to deceiving a group in order to get responses to test honesty.

Sharpless, Isaac. The honor system in examinations. *In his* The American college. Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday Page and company, 1915. p. 143–46.

The honor system is considered a phase of student government. Willingness to live up to the spirit of the pledge and to report dishonesty are cited as pre-requisites to a successful system.

Sills, K. C. M. Character: a neglected college-entrance requirement. Education, 35: 615–19, June, 1915.

Dean Sills, of Bowdoin college, lays blame for much of the dishonesty in college upon the lower schools. A more stringent test of character is suggested as a college-entrance requirement.

Smith, C. A. Honor in student life in colleges and universities. Educational review, 30: 384–95, November, 1905.

A paper read before the Department of higher education of the National education association at Asbury Park favoring the honor system. Opinions of educators are cited as evidence.

Stevens, D. H. Honor without system. School and society, 14: 613–16, December 24, 1921.

The danger of fallacious records, shortness of the terms of student officers, demands on the time of students, artificial distinctions between academic honesty and other brands are criticisms of the honor system. Honor, cooperation and good will come from mutual understanding, not from any system.

Stevens, W. L. Honor system. Nation, 98: 754, June 25, 1914.

The honor system is defended. It is pointed out that the basic foundation of the system is justice. The author holds that when the laws of the system are violated the only thing to do is to eliminate the student.

——— Honor system in American colleges. Popular science monthly, 68: 176–85, February, 1906.

The principles and values of the honor system are discussed together with the conditions which are favorable and unfavorable to the system.

Symonds, P. M. [Conduct codes and attitudes.] *In his* The nature of conduct. New York, The Macmillan company, 1928. p. 70–71, 78–79, 84–95, 180–183, 225, 232–233.

After pointing out the biological and physiological basis of conduct, the author shows how the principles of psychology apply to problems of character training. Problems of honesty and truthfulness are discussed or referred to on the various pages cited.

Venable, Francis P. A question of morals. Educational review, 46: 361–68, November, 1913.

The author discusses the need for and methods of conducting examinations. He upholds a system of honor without any spying as the best method. Illustrations are drawn from the systems at the universities of Virginia and North Carolina.

Youth and the honor system. Kadelpian review, 8: 266–67, March, 1929.

Students fail to report dishonesty among fraternity friends, for "loyalty to the group is stronger in most instances than allegiance to abstract standards of behavior." Social disapproval is discussed as a force in controlling cheating.

SECTION D. DESCRIPTIONS OF HONOR SYSTEMS AND METHODS OF HANDLING DISHONESTY IN SPECIFIC INSTITUTIONS

Are they without honor? New student, 7: 1–2, January 18, 1928.

The honor system in various colleges is discussed. A number of confessions of students to the president of Hunter college are included. "Peaching" and not "cribbing" is often considered the cardinal sin. The system fails when students can cheat with no loss of dignity.

Batcheller, J. H. The honor system at Oregon state agricultural college. Oregon education journal, 2: 11, 31–34, April, 1928.

The system, now about five years old, is described. The author believes the system has worked efficiently and that it is supported both by honest practices and by a feeling of obligation to report cases on the part of the large majority of students.

Birdseye, Clarence F. [Student honor at Amherst.] *In his* The reorganization of our colleges. New York, The Baker and Taylor company, 1909. p. 78–80.

The rules regulating the student honor system at Amherst college at this date are published in full with some discussion of the effectiveness of the system.

Chaplin, M. Honor system at Princeton. Education, 33: 312–14, January, 1913.

A brief summary is given of the history and characteristics of the honor system at Princeton. The chief features are the responsibility of students for its administration, the pledge of honest work and the duty to report suspected dishonesty.

Chauncey, A. W. Honor system of Sheffield scientific school. Education, 33: 315–17, January, 1913.

The conditions in the school are described along with the chief characteristics of the system adopted.

Echols, W. H. The eleventh commandment. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., Alumni bulletin, April, 1914.

This is an address setting forth facts about the system in force at the University of Virginia. A description is given of conditions surrounding its inception and its effectiveness over many years.

Firkins, O. W. Reply to Professor Sparrow on the honor system. Nation, 98: 632, May 28, 1914.

A short reply to certain charges of misinformation in regard to the working of the honor system at the University of Virginia.

Green, E. L. Honor system in South Carolina. Nation, 82: 117, February 8, 1906.

The history of the development of the system in South Carolina college, Columbia, S. C., is given.

Hall, A. C. Unique experiment in college democracy. Independent, 64: 1323a–1324, June 11, 1908.

The plan described was developed at Kenyon college and provided for an honor committee which had charge of enforcing the pledge of honor in examinations.

The honor plan at Cornell university. School and society, 26: 515–16, October 22, 1927.

This is a copy of a resolution approved by the faculty of the College of arts and sciences of Cornell to establish a joint Faculty-student committee for control of policies in regard to conducting examinations.

The honor system at Yale. School and society, 27: 394–95, March 31, 1928.

Students' lack of interest in methods of enforcing honesty at Yale is shown by the small vote on the honor system. Faculty supervision is the suggested alternative.

Kelly, F. J. Honor system in examination. *In his* The American art college. New York, The Macmillan company, 1925. p. 141–142, 147–49.

This book reports on numerous college problems investigated by personal visitation. The status of the honor system is discussed. Several colleges are cited whose students have recently voted against the system where reporting violations was one of the requirements. A few of the characteristics of systems in vogue at Stanford, California, Yale, North Carolina, and Vanderbilt are cited. It is the author's impression that no rapid change has occurred in the status of honor systems since Bird T. Baldwin's report in 1915.

Lile, William, Minor. The honor system. *In* American bar association. Report, 1910. p. 990–1002.

The origin, nature, operation and results of the honor system at the University of Virginia are explained. Objections which have been raised against the system are discussed along with counter arguments. Special emphasis is placed upon its application in law schools.

McGregor, W. Honor system in rural public schools. Popular educator, 42: 341–42, February, 1925.

The author describes a perfect system worked out in a two-room rural school in Canada. Its chief features are: (1) The pupils make their own regulations, (2) elect their own officers, (3) use the deduction of conduct points as penalties, and (4) use class averages to stimulate cooperative efforts toward improvement.

Marvin, G. Code of the Cavaliers: honor code of the University of Virginia. Outlook, 138: 723–27, December 31, 1924.

Three instances of the violation of the honor code are cited and a description of the system is given.

Miller, E. H. A successful honor system. *In* National student federation of the United States of America. Yearbook, 1928. Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Vassar college, 1928. p. 17–19.

A brief description of the successful system in force at Washington and Lee university.

Miner, J. B. The control of college cheating. School and society, 32: 199–204, August 9, 1930.

The plan of handling cheating at the University of Kentucky is described. For the first offense the student is dropped from the class in which he cheats and his parents are notified of his offense. If the student is detected a second time he is automatically suspended from the university. Careful proctoring and faculty cooperation are stressed as main points. Objections to an honor system are cited.

Peters, H. A. The honor system in secondary schools. School review, 32: 36–39, January, 1924.

The working of an honor system which had been in operation for five years in a secondary school in Cleveland, Ohio, is described.

Pierce, L. M. League for honesty in the Commercial high school, Atlanta, Georgia. School and society, 18: 773–75, December 29, 1923.

The system described is a type of proctor system not in the hands of students alone, but in which pupils and teachers have joint responsibilities. The signing of the pledge is optional. Procedures for handling cases and penalties are discussed.

Pott, W. S. A. The honor system of Virginia. Education, 33: 303–11, January, 1913.

The honor system of the University of Virginia is described. The observance of the pledge, the method of dealing with breaches, and its application outside of examinations are treated.

Smith, Henry Louis. The honor system and its practical operation. Lexington, Va., Washington and Lee university. 1925, 4 p. (Washington and Lee university bulletin vol. 27, no. 8, April 30, 1928.)

The essentials of an honor system are pointed out and its practical operation illustrated by citing examples of its influence at Washington and Lee university.

Sparrow, C. M. Honor system. Nation, 98: 631–32, May 28, 1914.

The author holds that the honor system "is student self-government by law." The four characteristics of the system at the University of Virginia are: (1) A high sense of honor among students, (2) assurance of justice, (3) absolute adherence to the pledge, (4) the single penalty.

Thornton, William M. The honor system in the University of Virginia in origin and use. *In* Association of colleges and preparatory schools of the Southern states. Proceedings, 1906. p. 24–40.

Also in Sewanee review, 15: 41–57, January, 1907.

A paper read before the association setting forth the history and practical working of the honor system at the University of Virginia. The system as described applies to cheating and lying in all aspects of university life. Many other activities which would be interpreted as offenses against accepted moral standards are ignored by the students under this particular system.

Tyler, Lyon G. The honor system among American colleges. Virginia journal of education, 8: 13–15, September, 1914.

"Gives reasons why the College of William and Mary, instead of the University of Virginia, should have credit for first introducing the honor system into American colleges."

Wilkins, Ernest Hatch. [The Honor commission at Chicago.] *In his* The changing college. Chicago, University of Chicago, 1927. p. 101–102.

The superiority of a joint faculty-student commission at the University of Chicago over an exclusive student commission is discussed.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1931

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. - - - - - - Price 5 cents